

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DA	ATE.	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/269,037	06/07/1999		JOACHIM WIETZKE	10191/994	9313	
26646	7590 00	2/07/2003				
KENYON & KENYON				EXAMINER		
ONE BROAD NEW YORK,				MCCHESNEY, E	MCCHESNEY, ELIZABETH A	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2644	17	
				DATE MAILED: 02/07/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	00,000,027		
	09/269,037	WIETZKE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elizabeth A McChesney	2644	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with th	ne correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.130 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period wi - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, of - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing of earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply b within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) Il apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAND	to timely filed days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_,		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under EDisposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-30</u> is/are pending in the application	1.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-30</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accept	ted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disap	pproved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl	y to this Office action.		
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	miner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Applie	cation No	
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Burn * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(e) (to a provisional application).	
a) The translation of the foreign language prov 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	• •		
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.		mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2644

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 03/18/1999 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because fail to provide translations. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any resubmission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 11-12 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sklorz (DE03812120).

Regarding claims 11-12 and 21-22, Sklorz discloses a traffic-radio-capable receiving set in which the automobile driver can receive messages which are digitized

Art Unit: 2644

and stored in the chip to be called up at any time through the user's touch of a button (abstract) and which reads on the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
 - (e) the invention was described in-
 - (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
 - (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).
- 5. Claims 11, 13-15, 17-19, 21, 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eisele et al. (US Patent No. 6,315,207).

Regarding **claim 11**, Eisele et al. (hereinafter, "Eisele") discloses a pocket interface unit (PIU) in conjunction with a smart diskette, or also known as a chip card, which incorporates electrical contacts and, or a read/write unit (col. 5-lines 57-58). Eisele further discloses the PIU is equipped with a microphone which could be used as a dictation device where spoken work is digitized and stored in the card chip. The PIU with card chip could be programmed to respond to simple voice commands as "save" and "run" which reads on outputting the stored message upon request in user-initiated response (col. 13-lines 24-35).

Regarding **claim 13**, Elisele further discloses outputting spoken text through the loudspeaker (col. 13-lines 42-47).

Art Unit: 2644

Regarding **claim 14**, Elisele further discloses a display wherein it inherent to output via the display (col. 13-lines 42-47).

Regarding **claim 15**, Eisele further discloses outputting spoken text through the loudspeaker (col. 13-lines 42-47), which is inherent that the message is being played back via the electrical device.

Regarding claim 16, Eisele further discloses the data on the smart diskette can be transferred later to a portable or desk-top PC, which reads on playing back the message via a second device.

Regarding claim 17, see Examiner's comments regarding claim 14.

Regarding claim 18, see Examiner's comments regarding claim 13.

Regarding **claim 19**, it is inherent that the length of the message is dependent on the capacity of the chip card.

Regarding claim 21, Eisele discloses a pocket interface unit (PIU) in conjunction with a smart diskette, or also known as a chip card, which incorporates electrical contacts and, or a read/write unit (col. 5-lines 57-58). Eisele further discloses the PIU is equipped with a microphone (input device) which could be used as a dictation device where spoken work is digitized (which inherently teaches a voice module) and stored in the card chip. The smart diskette includes a microprocessor for performing such tasks as memory (col. 2-lines 1-8). The PIU with card chip could be programmed to respond to simple voice commands as "save" and "run" which reads on outputting the stored message upon request in user-initiated response (col. 13-lines 24-35).

Art Unit: 2644

Regarding **claim 23**, Eisele discloses a microphone as an input device (col. 13-lines 24-27).

Regarding **claim 24**, Elisele further discloses outputting spoken text through the loudspeaker (col. 13-lines 42-47) of the PIU which reads on the reads on the record/read unit (col. 5-lines 57-58).

Regarding **claim 25**, Elisele further discloses the PIU is equipped with a display wherein it inherent to output via the display (col. 13-lines 42-47).

Regarding **claim 26**, Elisele further discloses multiple input devices, for example microphone, keyboard, and Braille keyboard (col. 13-lines 24, 42 and 51).

Regarding claim 27, see Examiner's comments regarding claim 26.

Regarding claim 28, see Examiner's comments regarding claim 21.

Regarding **claim 29**, Elisele further discloses multiple input devices, for example microphone, keyboard, and Braille keyboard (col. 13-lines 24, 42 and 51).

Regarding claim 30, see Examiner's comments regarding claim 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisele et al. (US Patent No. 6,315,207).

Art Unit: 2644

Regarding **claim 20**, Elisele further discloses the PIU is equipped with a display wherein it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to display the remaining memory space (col. 13-lines 42-47).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. McChesney whose telephone number is (703) 308-4563. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday, 8:00 am – 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W. Isen can be reached on (703) 305-4386.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Page 7

Art Unit: 2644

EAM SAW January 26, 2003

FORESTER W. ISEN
SUPERMISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2020